

FULL NAME	DUTY TO COOPERATE	LEGALLY COMPLIANT	SOUND	WHICH PART	WHICH PARAGRAPHS	WHICH POLICY	WHICH POLICY MAP	WHICH DIAGRAM	WHICH TABLE
Mr Richard Plant	No	No	No	Policies Map			HA59 Land to rear of Derry's Garden Centre, Cossington		

WHY PLAN NOT SOUND	MODIFICATIONS	HEARINGS	HEARING SESSIONS
<p>There is no reasoning for removing HS65 from the Draft Charnwood Local Plan 2019-36 and moving the whole allocation for Cossington onto HA59, previously HS66, to maintain the 124 total allocation for Cossington. This is an identical number in each plan.</p> <p>Charnwood must have been aware, and if not should have been, that the land previously identified as HS65 is being put forward for planning regardless of Charnwood's allocation. This effectively increases the allocation in Cossington to 181 and not the 124 detailed in the Draft Plan.</p> <p>If this is not the case can Charnwood explain where the 57 homes now submitted for planning P21/1446/2 are counted in Table 5 on page 27 of the draft plan.</p> <p>To maintain the 124 allocation HA59 should be moved back to a maximum of 70 as per the 2019-36 plan.</p> <p>It is interesting to note that the planning application already submitted for HA59 is for up to 130 homes which Charnwood state they are now supporting having removed HA65 and the fact that HA59 is providing the land for the Cossington school extension. Something that HS65 on previous plan is unable to do.</p> <p>My challenge is: -</p> <p>1. Why did Charnwood remove HS65 (Land West of Main Street and North of Syston Road) even though they must have been aware of the planning being outlined by Spitfire Homes.</p> <p>2. Why given point 1, have Charnwood increased the allocation for HA59 from the previous 70 to 124?</p> <p>3. Do Charnwood accept that their actions have actually increased Cossington's allocation from 124 to 181 by stealth?</p>	<p>Given that an application is already submitted for site HS65 which was on the Local Plan 2019-36 to maintain Cossington's allocation HA 59 must be amended back to the 70 previously identified and HS65 should be reinstated in the plan.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>To understand how Charnwood could move the total allocation to HA59 given the knowledge that the previous included site of HA65 was already progressing with development plans.</p>